

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed September 19, 2006, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 4 6-7 and 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by JP 09-083981 (Ikeda). Further, claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Ikeda. Claims 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Ikeda in view of U.S. 6,115,025 (Buxton). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-14 and 16 are patentable over Ikeda and Buxton for at least the following reasons.

Ikeda is directed to a picture communication equipment having a display screen which may be split and rotated to show two images. As clearly shown in FIGs 1c-1d, and 12-14 the displayed split images do NOT fill the entire screen. In FIG 12, reference numerals 324 and 325 show two images; however, as clearly recited

in paragraph [0068], reference numeral 324 is "synthetic image information 324" and reference numeral 325 is "rotation image information 325". That is, reference numerals 324 and 325 are merely information which are not displayed on the Ikeda screen. Rather, as specifically recited in the last sentence of paragraph [0068]:

the contraction image information 326 is chosen in the image selection section 314, and it is displayed on a screen in the image display section 301. (Emphasis added)

Thus, similar to FIGs 1c-1d, and 13-14, FIG 12 of Ikeda also merely teaches to display two images on a split screen, where the two images, namely the contraction image information 326, do NOT fill the screen.

In stark contrast, the present invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 6 which, amongst other patentable elements, requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

the second image and the third image
substantially filling the screen.

This feature is nowhere taught or suggested in Ikeda. Buxton is cited to allegedly show other features and does not remedy the deficiencies in Ikeda. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted

that independent claims 1 and 6 should be allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-5, 7-14 and 16 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 6.

In addition, Applicant denies any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicant reserves the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
November 28, 2006

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101